

6
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

MICHAEL J. FLYNN)
Plaintiff)
VS.)
LAFAYETTE RONALD HUBBARD)
a/k/a L. RON HUBBARD)
Defendant)

CIVIL ACTION
NO. 83-2642-C

MOTION TO APPROVE SUBSTITUTED SERVICE
OF PROCESS ON L. RON HUBBARD

Plaintiff respectfully moves that this court approve substituted service of process on defendant. As grounds therefor, plaintiff states as follows:

1. Plaintiff, after diligent search, has been unable to locate defendant.

Since approximately October, 1979, as counsel for other litigants suing defendant, plaintiff has sought to locate defendant in order to serve him with process. These efforts have included the use of constables, investigators, depositions, interrogatories and the filing of In Re Estate of L. Ron Hubbard, #47150 (Riverside Sup. Ct., Calif.), a separate law suit, one of the primary purposes of which was to determine whether defendant was or was not a missing

person. These efforts have been unsuccessful. See plaintiff's Affidavit, paragraphs # 2-4, annexed hereto as Exhibit A .

2. The reason these efforts have been unsuccessful is that defendant has intentionally concealed himself in order to avoid service of process, as is outlined below.
3. Plaintiff has alleged the existence of an agency and a close connection and relationship between the Church of Scientology and defendant. See Complaint, paragraphs #5-9. Yet prior to February, 1983, the Church of Scientology and its attorneys -- and even defendant's attorney -- had stated that the present address of defendant is unknown, that they know of no means of communicating with him and that the Church of Scientology of California has not communicated with defendant since February, 1980. See Order of Judge Krentzman, denying Attorney Alan Goldfarb's motion to withdraw a counsel for defendant and Affidavit of Attorney Julia Dragojevic, annexing correspondence from Attorney Lawrence E. Heller of Lenske, Lenske, Heller & Magasin annexed as Exhibits B and C respectively.
4. Two Federal District Courts, including this Court, have ruled that defendant has intentionally concealed himself in order to avoid service of process and accordingly have allowed